

## **SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

### Attendees, Date and Type of Interview

A telephonic interview was conducted on January 13, 2010. The participants of the interview were Examiner Colbert and the Applicants' attorney, Ted M. Cannon, of Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear LLP.

### Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None

### Identification of Claims Discussed

Claim 26

### Identification of Prior Art Discussed

Because there was no prior art rejection in the October 15, 2010 Office Action, the Examiner and Applicants' attorney did not discuss any specific prior art reference. However, the Examiner indicated generally that she was considering rejecting the claims based on one or more of the numerous references of record related to the autobytel.com website. The Applicants' attorney encouraged the Examiner to carefully examine those references and to determine whether the claims are patentable in view of those references and the other art of record.

### Proposed Amendments

The Applicants' attorney proposed amending Claim 26 to change the phrase "computer-readable medium" to "computer storage medium." The Applicants' attorney further proposed amending Claim 26 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion in the Office Action.

### Principal Arguments and Other Matters

Although the Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's rejections, the Applicants' proposed to amend Claim 26 to expedite prosecution. The Applicants' attorney argued that Claim 26, as amended as proposed, and the other pending claims, would meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112. The Applicants' attorney also pointed out support in the specification for the claimed software modules.

### Results of Interview

It is the understanding of Applicants' attorney that the Examiner will withdraw all rejections set forth in the October 15, 2010 Office Action and will examine the claims, as amended, in view of the autobytel.com references.